

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the instant Amendment, Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, and 14 have been amended to more particularly point out Applicants' invention. Claims 3, 4, and 16 and 17 have been amended into independent form. Various claims have been amended to overcome various rejections.

The figures were objected to because of text descriptions and missing reference numerals. The figures have been amended to explicitly provide the text descriptions and/or reference numerals. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 14-17 were objected to because of various informalities and use of the term "adapted." Various claims have been amended in accordance with the suggestions in paragraph 2 of the Official Action, to replace "adapted" with "configured," or otherwise to overcome the bases for the objections.

Claims 3-6, 8-9, 12-13, and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

With regard to claims 3-4 and 16-17, the Official Action states the specification "does not teach or describe a proxy server/one or more routers that directs the call signaling to the local gatekeepers if the local gatekeepers are available and to the backup gatekeepers when the local gatekeepers are not." The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the discussion of FIG. 4:

If the endpoint UA1 wants to establish a call to another user UA2, the endpoint UA1 sends an ARQ message (AdmissionRequest) 402a, which is to be routed by the router or proxy server to the gatekeeper GK. Either the router or the proxy server determines, however, that the client gatekeeper GK is not in service. The backup gatekeeper GKB receives the ARQ message from the router, identifies the user local gatekeeper, and, in 404, accesses the gatekeeper profile database to identify the services to be provided for the non-functioning gatekeeper GK.

Thus, applicant respectfully submits that the claim language is fully supported in the Specification.

With regard to claims 3-4, 8-9, 12-13, and 16-17, in FIG. 1, the presence of a

“not available” gatekeeper in the signaling path to external networks was indicated to be non-enabling. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the drawing was clearly indicated to be “exemplary only,” and that FIGS. 4 and 5 provide discussion of such signaling. Furthermore, FIG. 1 also provides several gateways that are described as coupling the ToL networks to external networks.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art would be easily capable of practicing the present invention. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 1-2, 5-15, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Galasso et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,374,302 (“Galasso”). In order for there to be anticipation, each and every element of the claimed invention must be present in a single prior reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Galasso.

As discussed in the Specification, some embodiments of the present invention include a plurality of Internet Protocol voice networks, such as telephony over LAN (ToL) networks, including primary gatekeepers. A Service Provider maintains a backup gatekeeper for each of the ToL networks. The backup gatekeeper maintains a database associated with all the ToL networks it provides backup service to. A proxy server or router receives all gatekeeper requests and first tries to forward the request to the primary gatekeeper. If the appropriate gatekeeper fails to respond, the proxy server or router forwards the request to the backup gatekeeper, which handles the call.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite wherein a router or proxy server determines if a local gatekeeper is available prior to routing a call request to the backup gatekeeper; claim 6 has been amended to recite “a plurality of local gatekeeper modules corresponding to local gatekeepers associated with said telecommunications gatekeeper, wherein said control unit is configured to select for operation individual ones of said local gatekeeper modules when corresponding ones of said local gatekeepers are reported by a router or proxy server as being unavailable;” claim 7 has been amended to recite “a proxy server or router configured to determine if a corresponding one of the local gatekeepers is unavailable;” claim 11 has been

amended to recite "providing backup gatekeeper services from a backup gatekeeper if any of said local gatekeepers are determined by an associated router or proxy server to not be available;" and claim 14 has been amended to recite "providing a proxy server or router configured to determine if a corresponding one of the local gatekeepers is unavailable."

In contrast, to the extent that Galasso provides backup gatekeepers, Galasso teaches use of "redundant gatekeeper processes" (Col. 4, lines 9-10) in which a master backup gatekeeper is maintained as a "hot backup" that is maintained "in a state identical to the state of the primary master gatekeeper." (Col. 7, lines 15-16). Applicant notes that Galasso is silent as to the particulars of how the backup function is initiated. However, Column 4 states that "[r]edundant gatekeeper processes can pass queries back and forth so they remain synchronized with the current state of the network at all times." Thus, it appears that the backup gatekeeper itself must monitor the primary gatekeeper. In contrast, in a system according to embodiments of the present invention, a proxy server or router is provided that determines if a local gatekeeper is unavailable. If so, then the backup is activated. As can be appreciated, this can conserve valuable network bandwidth at, among other times, call startup. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

Date: 10/21/05

Respectfully submitted,

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
**Customer Number: 28524**  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830  
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department  
Telephone: (732) 321-3026

By: Heather Mueller  
Heather Mueller, Reg. No. 39,033  
ON BEHALF OF:  
David D. Chung, Reg. No. 38,409  
Attorney for Applicants  
Tel: 650-694-5339  
Fax: 650-968-4517




FIG. 2






FIG. 3





**DRAWINGS**

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached Annotated Sheets 1/4, 2/4 and 4/4 shows changes to Fig. 1, 2, and 5. Also attached are Replacement Sheets 1/4, 2/4 and 4/4 for the formalized drawings.